



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,838	11/19/2001	Aaron A. Goodisman	VAO-001.02	9385

25181 7590 09/17/2004

FOLEY HOAG, LLP  
PATENT GROUP, WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST  
155 SEAPORT BLVD  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE


ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/988,838	Applicant(s) GOODISMAN ET AL. 	
	Examiner Laurie Ries	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/14/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, and 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) in further view of Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1).

As per claim 1, Horowitz discloses a method of modifying a document containing at least one object that includes providing at least one object in memory based on a global configuration, as set forth in claim 1 (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 66-67), and creating an association between the object in the document and the object(s) in memory based on context data (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 1-5). Horowitz does not disclose expressly, based on the association, replacing the object in the document with an abbreviated form of the object. Kudrolli discloses a system and method for replacing text with an abbreviated version. (See Kudrolli, Column 4, lines 1-40, and Column 1, lines 6-17). Horowitz and Kudrolli are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the abbreviation method of Kudrolli with the association between the document object and memory object(s) of Horowitz. The motivation for doing so would have been to make up

for spatial limitations of a display screen. (See Kudrolli, Column 1, lines 12-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kudrolli with Horowitz for the benefit of accommodating a more limited display to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per claim 3, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses creating an association based on at least one object, which is included in the possible associations set forth in claim 3. (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 66-67, and Column 8, lines 1-9).

As per claim 5, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses that the object is a word or group of words, which are included in the possible object types set forth in claim 5. (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 59-64).

As per claim 6, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses generating a selectable link. (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 32-38).

As per claim 7, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses providing at least one association feature including an anchor link, which is one of the possible association features set forth in claim 7. (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 24-31).

As per claim 8, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses creating an association based on linguistic processing of the document, which is one of the possible associations set forth in claim 8. (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 50-67, and Column 9, lines 1-12).

As per claim 9, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses that the document format includes HTML, which is one of the possible formats set forth in claim 9. (See Horowitz, Column 4, lines 1-12).

As per claim 10, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses identifying a link and a pop-up window, which are among the list of possible choices set forth in claim 10. (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 30-31).

As per claim 11, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses providing at least one application to be executed upon selection of the association. (See Horowitz, Column 10, lines 64-67, and Column 11, lines 1-2).

As per claim 12, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses executing at least one application. (See Horowitz, Column 10, lines 64-67, and Column 11, lines 1-2).

As per claim 13, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses providing an index, which is among the list of possible choices set forth in claim 13. (See Horowitz, Column 6, lines 45-48).

As per claim 14, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses providing a protocol that includes Hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), which is among the list of possible protocols set forth in claim 14. (See Horowitz, Column 4, lines 11-12).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kraft (U.S. Patent 6,137,488).

As per claim 2, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz and Kudrolli do not disclose expressly providing a toggle object in the abbreviated document to convert the object to an unabbreviated version and vice versa. Kraft discloses providing a toggle button to display either a fully-shown form or a shortened form. (See Kraft, Column 12, lines 26-28). Horowitz, Kudrolli and Kraft are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the toggle button of Kraft with the abbreviated document of Horowitz and Kudrolli. The motivation for doing so would have been to make up for spatial limitations of a display screen. (See Kudrolli, Column 1, lines 12-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kraft with Horowitz and Kudrolli for the benefit of accommodating a more limited display to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Marcy (U.S. Patent 6,662,342 B1).

As per claim 4, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz and Kudrolli do not disclose expressly that creating the association includes creating based on at least one of a time of day, location, user profile, security clearance, job function, job description, document type, document location, application executing on the device or a user identity. Marcy discloses creating an association based on document type. (See Marcy, Column 4, lines 30-67, and Column 5, lines 1-8). Horowitz, Kudrolli and Marcy are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the association based on document type of Marcy with the creation of the association between the document object and the object(s) in memory of Horowitz and Kudrolli. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the structure of the document. (See Marcy, Column 4, lines 30-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Marcy with Horowitz and Kudrolli for the benefit of defining the document structure to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) in further view of Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717).

As per claim 15, Horowitz discloses a method of modifying a document containing at least one object that includes providing at least one object in memory based on a global configuration, as set forth in claim 1 (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 66-67), and creating an association between the object in the document and the

object(s) in memory based on context data (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 1-5).

Horowitz also discloses inserting a tag in the document. (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 5-9). Horowitz does not disclose expressly that the tag is a pre-configured response.

Reed discloses the use of a pre-configured response or standard answer. (See Reed, Column 75, lines 10-15). Horowitz and Reed are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the preconfigured response of Reed with the object of Horowitz. The motivation for doing so would have been to organize information in a form that simplifies transfer of data. (See Reed, Column 8, lines 52-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reed with Horowitz for the benefit of simplifying the data transfer process to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

As per claim 16, Horowitz and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Horowitz also discloses that the pre-configured response is selectable. (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 32-37).

As per claim 17, Horowitz and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Reed also discloses executing at least one function based on a selection of the pre-configured response. (See Reed, Column 75, lines 14-30).

Horowitz and Reed are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the execution of a function of Reed with the preconfigured response object of Horowitz and Reed. The motivation for



Art Unit: 2176

doing so would have been to provide a list of documents or links that the user could select from. (See Reed, Column 75, lines 17-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reed with Horowitz and Reed for the benefit of allowing the user to select among possible documents or links to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Vanechanos, Jr (U.S. Patent 5,884,309).

As per claim 18, Horowitz and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Horowitz and Reed do not disclose expressly that the pre-configured response is one of a Yes, No and telephone number. Vanechanos, Jr discloses a user may provide a yes or no answer. (See Vanechanos, Jr, Column 8, lines 3-9). Horowitz, Reed and Vanechanos, Jr are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the yes or no response of Vanechanos, Jr with the standard answer of Horowitz and Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to organize the information in a form that simplifies transfer of data. (See Reed, Column 8, lines 52-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Vanechanos, Jr with Horowitz and Reed for the benefit of simplifying the data transfer process to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Armstrong (U.S. Patent 6,356,633 B1).

As per claim 19, Horowitz and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Horowitz and Reed do not disclose expressly communicating the pre-configured response upon selection of the pre-configured response to at least one of a telephone server and an email server. Armstrong discloses the use of an email server and telephone system to send responses to a user. (See Armstrong, Column 9, lines 12-18, and Column 4, lines 55-65). Reed and Armstrong are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the email server of Armstrong with the pre-configured response of Horowitz and Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to route and track responses to and from a user (See Armstrong, Column 4, lines 2-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Armstrong with Horowitz and Reed for the benefit of routing and tracking responses to and from a user to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Marcy (U.S. Patent 6,662,342 B1).

As per claim 20, Horowitz and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Horowitz and Reed do not disclose expressly that creating the

association includes creating based on at least one of a time of day, location, user profile, security clearance, job function, job description, document type, document location, application executing on the device or a user identity. Marcy discloses creating an association based on document type. (See Marcy, Column 4, lines 30-67, and Column 5, lines 1-8). Horowitz, Reed and Marcy are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the association based on document type of Marcy with the creation of the association between the document object and the object(s) in memory of Horowitz and Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the structure of the document. (See Marcy, Column 4, lines 30-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Marcy with Horowitz and Reed for the benefit of defining the document structure to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Jaremko (U.S. Patent 5,621,871) discloses an automated system for annotation using callouts.
- Appelt (U.S. Publication 2003/0078766 A1) discloses a natural language information querying system.


Art Unit: 2176

- Nielson (U.S. Patent 6,199,071 B1) discloses a method and apparatus for archiving hypertext documents.
- Bernstein (U.S. Patent 5,297,249) discloses hypermedia link marker abstract and search services.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is currently (703) 605-1238. After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAR

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER